Smith's Report

ON THE HOLOCAUST CONTROVERSY

Number 65, November 1999

Smith's Report informs contributors of what Smith is doing, with a lot of help from his friends, to take revisionist theory to the campus, to media, and to the American people.

Friend:

The Campus Project kicked off good in October. ***Smith's Report*** has a facelift. We have a new bi-monthly publication, ***The Revisionist***—which you should have received a couple weeks ago. TR has been distributed via the student newspaper at Hofstra University in Hempsted, New York (see story below). And the stats for CODOHWeb demonstrate that the number of On-line revisionist documents are being accessed at a rate of 15,00 to 20,000 times daily!

The announcement, or advertisement, for this years Campus Project focuses on Holocaust Studies programs, and how accusations of "hate" are used as tools, with utter hypocrisy, to suppress and censor the revisionist critique of what is taught in those programs. It employs our old friend Elie Wiesel—again. He's such an easy target it almost seems unfair to shame him again, but he is used, and he uses himself, so ubiquitously, that it's difficult to avoid using him ourselves.

The ad is headed: "Holocaust Studies: An Appointment with Hate?" and is reproduced (slightly reduced) on page four of this issue of **SR**. As of this writing it has run at U Maine-Orono, Iowa State U-Ames, Boise State U, U Minnesota-Duluth, and for the first time many first-time top liberal arts colleges, many of them Christian. Among those confirmed as of this date are Augsburg College (MN), Wheaton College (IL), Pacific Union College (CA), Wilson College (PA), Lock Haven U (PA), Bowdin College (ME), Berea College (KY), Stonehill College (MA), Shepperd College (WV), Coe College (IA) and Ohio Wesleyan U. At OWU there was something of a flap, which I learned about when a Columbus Dispatch reporter called to ask why I was submitting these ads everywhere. In the next issue of **SR** I'll print a full rundown of where the ad has run.

I did an end run around the ADL this year by going, for the first time, to smaller but top liberal arts colleges around the country. I didn't know what to expect, many are religious schools, and it is unlikely that any of their editors have ever before held a revisionist text in their hands. Nevertheless another dozen of these top private colleges have already signed up to run the ad over the next ten days.

On the day the ad ran at Iowa State U, on 15 October, the hits on CODOHWeb shot up to 25,000. That's what it means to run these ads. It isn't only the text of the ad, but what the ad message advertises in addition to its text—CODOHWeb, our vast revisionist library, and find out for himself what is *behind* the ad.

Last year we got so many responses when I sent out our $250,000 offer that I couldn't keep up with it—I was dealing with some 200 ad reps and editors. Everything else went begging. It's rather a trade-off—if I submit the ad to too many. papers I can't stay on top of the work; if I send to too few the results are slow coming in. You never know which way the wind will blow.

Every three or four years ***Smith's Report*** takes on a new look and new form, as it does with this issue. Its function remains what it has been through each previous transformation—to inform you of what I am doing, with a lot of help from my friends, to take revisionist theory to the universities, the media, and through those agencies to the widest possible public.

Those of you who have been with ***Smith's Report*** for four years or longer will have been aware that with issue 31 **SR** expanded its breadth of reporting. There was WorldScope reporting on revisionism worldwide, Internet Round -up with Richard, an occasional piece by David Thomas on how CODOHWeb actually works, and we were beginning to publish some original scholarship.

The main figure behind those changes in **SR** was Ted O'Keefe, formally an editor of the *Journal for Historical Review*, and an old buddy. Just about the time Ted offered to help, I was turning my attention to CODOHWeb, in addition to running the Campus Project, working on a couple books that I keep talking about but never have time to finish, and the rest of what has to be done around here.

Things change. Now Ted has returned to his old hangout, the Institute for Historical Review, and his old friends, Mark Weber and Greg Raven. Several years ago Ted was one of the casualties of the fallout between the Institute and Willis Carto.

That situation, which was something of a catastrophe for the Institute, for Mr. Carto, and for revisionism all together, is slowing being settled. The Institute is about to get some of the money diverted from it, O'Keefe has returned, and there are several new publishing projects in the works there. With the usual round of never-ending work, and a little luck, IHR is going to reclaim its place in the consciousness of the American public as the leading revisionist center in the US.

So—what's going to happen to ***Smith's Report*** under these new circumstances? **SR** is not a project unto itself. The Project is more important that **SR**. Yet, without **SR**, I have no funding, so there is no Project. It's something of a catch-22. I either have to put more time into ***Smith's Report*** and less into the Campus Project, or I have to do the opposite. I have to choose.

I have chosen to focus on the Campus Project, because that's where the work is. **SR** speaks to the converted—that's its purpose. It's the converted who fund outreach to the unconverted. There is no other way to do it. The Campus Project speaks to the great middle, the top end of the great middle, the unconverted, and I have upped the ante there by distributing *The Revisionist* free to the editors at 500 of the top universities and colleges across the nation. I will do that with each issue. I want to make ***The Revisionist*** part of the campus culture.

I will be doing ***Smith's Report*** only five times a year rather than eleven, so I will no longer be able to call it "America's Only Monthly Revisionist Newsletter." Keep in mind that while you will receive only five issues of **SR**, you will get six issues of *The Revisionist*. So you are still going to hear from us every month—except for August when I am supposed to take my family and the dogs for a motor trip. Nevertheless, those of you who have contributed to the Project and do not approve of this turn of events may want your money refunded. You have that right, and a post card will do the trick.

The Revisionist, of course, is not a sure bet. I'm not supposed to say that, it's bad for business, but there you are. This is another of my high-wire acts. I think I can pull it off. Maybe I'll fall on my face. I believe I have the right idea, the right people, the right target audience, and the right strategy. We'll see.

You have read in the cover letter that arrived with your copy of the first issue of **TR** how I plan to use it—having it distributed by the thousands on college campuses by inserting the magazine in student newspapers. This has never been done before. The worst scenario is that no newspaper will agree to accept it. The next worst is that I will be able to get it distributed the way I want but it will prove to boring for students to be interested in it. I really do not expect that to happen.

TR stands alone as the first revisionist publication in America (anywhere?) that will go directly to student editors—and city editors, key journalists, feature writers, and others in the mainstream press. It will go as well to university journalism departments and professional press organizations around the country. Focusing, as it will, on topical cultural and political issues which affect, and are affected by, revisionism, and at the same time being distributed on one college campus after another, it's going to be very difficult for either the professors or the press to pretend indifference to us.

You say (I can hear you saying): "You don't have time to manage the Campus Project and do your newsletter both. Now you're

adding a 20,000-word journal to your work schedule six times a year. Reducing the number of SR's you do each year and replacing them with six issues of *The Revisionist* doesn't sound like less work. It sounds like more work.

Well, I'm not going to do TR by myself—I promise you that. I have recruited, if I can use that word, an editor-in-chief who is going to run the whole shebang—run it elegantly and tough. George Brewer is a trained historian (Columbia and Berkeley) who knows how to write, crack a joke and produce! You've never heard of him? Of course not. He lives in the real world, has a real family, real children, a real job, and can not take a chance on being outed and bankrupted by the usual perpetrators.

This is America, he's not going to be thrown in the slammer for not keeping it zipped up about revisionism, but he runs the very real risk of losing his career and his living both. He deserves a break. It's a clumsy situation, but that's how it has to be for the immediate future. When our ship comes in—it's nowhere in sight yet—Brewer can come out of the closet and live a normal life—normal for us.

There were many problems putting together the first issue of ***The Revisionist***, some of which you can see in the production itself. But the final pain in the neck was with my printer. I chose to use the printer who printed the one issue of ***Revisionist Letters*** I published ten years ago, San Dieguito Printers in San Marcus, a town north of San Diego.

To make certain they did not get any surprises with TR, I gave them two copies of ***Revisionist Letters*** up front, so they knew what kind of project we were talking about. We worked back and forth for the best part of a month. On the day San Dieguito Printers was to actually print TR, a lady named Jean Faulkner called, introduced herself as the business manager for San Dieguito, and said the company had decided against printing TR.

Rather than telling me why, she started beating around the bush. She was trying to be a little charming about it. To get her out of her misery I asked if the problem might be "content." She was immediately relieved. Yes, it was content. Who had turned up at the last minute to decry the content of TR? No one in particular. One person in the company had this reservation, another that one. Everybody appeared to be part of the decision.

When I asked around I discovered two things about San Dieguito Printing: it's run by women (they apparently suffer from the same lack of principle as men) who do a major part of their business with city, county and state agencies—so there's the rub. What would happen with their government contracts if it got out they were printing a revisionist magazine?

I don't complain about these little events; that's how the game is played. You have to know how to lose. This is a game where you are going to experience a lot of losing. If you want to promote revisionist theory and you don't know how to lose, if losing keeps you up at night and makes you kick your dog and bark at your wife and kids, this just isn't the game for you.

The first person I called after Jean Faulkner's call to me was David Thomas. He guided me to a printer I had used maybe four years before, for a different kind of job, and who I had forgotten about. One phone call, a three-hour drive north across the border, a one-half hour chat, and I was in business again. Would this printer come through? You betcha'.

Nine days later, two days behind schedule but what the hell, I had 25,000 copies of TR stacked up on two pallets in their warehouse. There were some production problems, as you might have noticed with your own copy, particularly the back cover, and unnecessary empty space inside the book. There were also two awful bloopers—both of them my fault. I had referred to Peter Novick, both on the cover an in the lead on page 19, as "Robert." Nevertheless, there it was.

I see ***The Revisionist*** as one more missing link in the Campus Project that is no longer missing—one more instrument, on top of the advertisements we run with such success, that will strengthen the direct connection between myself and student editors, and beyond between CODOHWeb and the press worldwide.

Because of its topicality and reasonable intellectual tone (without being academically stuffy), TR will encourage student editors to have some confidence in the materials, not only in TR itself, but in the great revisionist library that is in place and still a-building on CODOHWeb. And it will give a broad, steady support base to the advertisements we are running. The professors might try to dismiss the ads as mere provocations, but that won't wash so easily with TR and CODOHWeb.

It's been suggested that rather than piling a new load of work on myself publishing a magazine for the campus (and off-campus) press, that I print larger runs of *Smith's Report*

Holocaust Studies

Appointment with Hate?*

Let's agree that one ideal of the university is to promote intellectual freedom, and one ideal of the professorial class is to teach students to honor it. Yet this is not true in Holocaust Studies. There, if students express doubt about "eyewitness" testimony, for example, even if it is demonstrably false, dishonorable or both, they understand they run the danger of being accused of being "hateful."

Consider eyewitness testimony given by Nobel Laureate **Elie Wiesel.**

Elie Wiesel as an "eyewitness" authority

EW claims he was "liberated" from Dachau (*Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, 11 April 1983), "liberated" from Buchenwald (*NYT*, 2 Nov. 1986), and "liberated" from Auschwitz (*NY Post*, 23 Oct. 1986, and *NYT*, 4 Jan. 1987). One of these claims may be true. The others are false. Do the professors believe it matters?

EW claims in *All Rivers Run to the Sea* (NY, 1995): "I read [Immanuel Kant's] *The Critique of Pure Reason* in Yiddish." Kant's *Critique* has not been translated into Yiddish. Here again, **EW** did not tell the truth. Does it matter?

EW claims that after Jews were executed at Babi Yar in the Ukraine, "geysers of blood" spurted from their grave for "months" afterward (See *Paroles d'etranger*, 1982, p. 86). Impossible? Yes, it is. Do the professors believe it matters?

When Holocaust Studies professors are too fearful to condemn such claims, and those who make them, what are their students to do?

Elie Wiesel as an authority on "hate"

Elie Wiesel has won the hearts and minds of Holocaust Studies professors with his counsel on how to perpetuate a loathing for Germans:

> Every Jew, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate—healthy virile hate—for what the German personifies and for what persists in the German.
>
> *(*Legends of Our Time*, "Appointment with Hate," NY, Avon, 1968, pp. 177-178).

Students understand the implications of this statement when brought to their attention, while their professors appear not to. Perhaps if we change one word in Elie Wiesel's sage advice, it will focus their attention: "Every Palestinian, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate—healthy virile hate—for what the Jew personifies and for what persists in the Jew." Does this help?

How is **EW** perceived in Holocaust Studies? He is esteemed as a moral authority. Chairs are created in his honor. Students are taught to emulate him.

Holocaust Studies and the exploitation of hate

In Holocaust Studies, hate is all the rage. To merely note that Stephen Spielberg based his "factual" movie *Schindler's List* on a cheap novel—is hate. To suggest that the "Diary" of Anne Frank is not an authentic personal diary (and should not be taught as such), but a "literary production" crafted by Anne, and after the war by others, from a cache of miscellaneous writings and inventions—that's hate. Exposing false eyewitness testimony is hate. Exposing forged Nuremberg documents is hate. Exposing faked photographs and the use of torture by the Allies to produce confessions by Germans is hate. Asking for proof that one (one!) Jew was gassed in any German camp as part of a program of "genocide" is hate. Asking what "crimes against humanity" National Socialists committed during WWII that Republicans and Democrats did not commit is hate. To note that the story is immensely profitable for those who administer it is hate. Arguing for intellectual freedom regarding any of this—that's hate too. That is, commenting on the record is hate. Telling the truth about the record is hate. Having an open mind is hate.

The unspoken ethical and intellectual scandal in Holocaust Studies is that key materials used in these programs are soaked through with fraud and falsehood—led by the use of false and ignoble eyewitness testimony. Here we have highlighted the hapless Elie Wiesel, but the literature is full of "eyewitnesses" who gave false testimony about gas chambers and a great many other matters.

For more information on **Elie Wiesel** and other problematic eyewitnesses—such as **Simon Wiesenthal, Dr. Hadassah Bimko (Rosensaft), Filip Mueller, Rudolf Vrba, Kurt Gerstein, Mel Mermelstein,** go to our site on the Web and follow "revisionism." For background on myself, follow my name.

10699

Bradley R. Smith, Director
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)
Fax: 858 309 4385
POB 439016, San Diego CA, 92143

www.codoh.com

and distribute that to college editors and the rest of the press. Kill two birds with one rock. But SR does not address revisionist issues from a perspective that is profitable for newspaper editors. It has a different target audience entirely—you. It has a different purpose—to tell you what is happening with the Project. Newspaper editors are not interested in this Project. They want to ignore it. They want it to go away.

To the left is a somewhat reduced reproduction of the 2-column by 12-inch ad we're running in student papers this fall. We've had an unusually high rate of papers that made a deal to run the ad, accepted payment, then reneged. I'm uncertain why this should be, but it's been suggested that the language is too strong. Maybe it is, but I don't want to run $200 ads that say nothing.

GIVING INTERVIEWS

I've mentioned this story before, but it puts other matters in perspective to mention it again here.

About five years ago I was sitting at the computer in my garage in Visalia when the phone rang. It was Mike Wallace. He wanted to interview me for 60 Minutes. I suppose a booking agent had called earlier and I had refused. Wallace and I had a pleasant chat but I told him that I had decided to not do interviews for TV or radio that were not live. I was not happy with they way they were turning out.

A couple days later Wallace called again to ask that I change my mind. He was so decent about it, and so professional, that I changed my

mind and told him that if he allowed David Cole to appear with me, that we would do 60 Minutes. Plans began to be made. After a couple days I called one of Wallace's producers and told him I'd changed my mind and that I would not do the show because it was not live. Wallace rang me back a third time, but I stuck to my guns. When I saw the finished product, though it was not a bad piece of work, I could see that Wallace did not know what the story was and I was glad I had not given him anything.

When I first started doing radio, then TV, I never turned down an interview before the camera. After awhile I got tired of the way TV interviews in particular were handled. I'd be saying something perfectly ordinary about revisionist theory and on the screen behind me the viewer at home would see images of skeletal cadavers being bulldozed into mass graves at Belsen, or Hitler or one of his guys giving the seig heil salute.

The final (final) turning point came when I agreed to do the Morton Downy TV show a couple months before the back and forth with 60 Minutes. I made an agreement with the Downy people that they were not going to pull the same old tricks while I was on the program with him. They kept to the agreement. During commercials, however, there were the old newsreels of the Brits bulldozing skeletal cadavers into mass graves while I sat across from Downy waiting for the interview to be picked up again.

Print journalists are not much better. From one point of view they are just innocent. They really do not know what the story is. Journalists believe the revisionist story is about the resurgence of Nazism and hate. They're not stupid, but they've been stupefied on this issue by the academics and their own rhetoric. I decided that I would not give live interviews to print journalists where I did not record the interview for my own use.

Last year I broke this rule with Harvey Gottlieb, a journalism professor at San Jose State University. I met with him at San Diego State and when we sat down to talk I found my audio recorder did not work. I asked Gottlieb if he would dub a copy of the tape he was making and send it to me and he said, sure, so I went ahead with the interview. When I asked him for the dub he told me he had been advised that it would be best if he did not supply me with a copy of the tape. So there you are. The best rule of thumb when you work with media is that you keep to your rules of thumb.

Early this year I received telephone calls from two independent film companies asking for an interview. I turned them both down because the interviews would not be live—the form itself did not allow for it. One of the people who contacted me was working for the Earllol Morris people, the company that made "Dr. Death" and which has gotten very interesting reviews.

Ernst Zuendel and Mark Weber both consented to be interviewed for the film. Ingrid Rimland and Zuendel are both very high on the film, tho not with out some reservations. Maybe my rule of thumb failed me on this one, but I am not despondent. Up front, there is no way to know, and I don't want to have to bother trying to "intuit" the intentions of every media organization or journalist who approaches me.

My rule of thumb served me very well in April of this year when Avi Muchnick, editor–in-chief of the Queens College *Quad*, was going to run the $250,000 offer ad and wanted to interview me by telephone for an editorial that would be published the day the ad was run. I agreed to do the interview by email or fax, and that's what we did. My experience with Avi reconfirmed my decision to not give any media a canned interview.

Avi and I had some back and forth via email, and when I got his first series of questions, the first questions was: "Do you consider the black race inferior to the white race? As a whole are they of equal intelligence?" I tried to get Avi to tell me what the hell that had to do with the text in the $250,000 Offer advertisement but he could not make it clear to me. He did not have to, of course, because I knew what it was about.

Over the last 30 days I have given a print reporter from an Ivy League university an interview via e-mail, turned down a request from a major German television station for a canned, on-camera interview, and am completing an interview with a *Los Angeles Times* reporter via email. Reporters representing the Hofstra *Chronicle* and the U South Carolina *Gamecock* interviewed me via fax and both worked out well.

I have lost a number of interviews because I do them my way now rather than their way, but I can live with it. Those I do give interviews to will not so easily make of me the mere playthings of uninformed or ill willed ladies and gents of the media.

UMASSACHUSETTS Molly Sherman , advertising director at the

Daily Collegian at U Massachusetts (Amherst) accepted our Holocaust Studies ad. When editorial saw the text, it was decided it would be a good idea to run it past the faculty advisor.

The editor rang me up and we chatted for a few minutes. He volunteered his view that the history of a great war is written by the victors. He wanted to know who I held responsible for what happened to the Jews of Europe during WWII. I replied: "The German state."

When I next heard from Ms. Sherman it was to be told that the *Collegian* would not run the ad, but would run the last five lines of text that appear in the ad, as an advertisement for CODOHWeb. I agreed I would do that, tho I would have to format the five lines in some way that made sense. I did it, sent it to advertising, and we had a deal. Better than nothing, particularly in a paper like the Collegian, which is the largest circulation (20,000+) student newspaper in Massachusetts.

At one time I ran small ads regularly in student newspapers, but gradually fell away from them. Of course, a small ad is not as productive as a big ad, everything else being equal, but a small ad at an important university advertising CODOHWeb can bring people to the Website and will occasionally produce a good story.

I think it might be a good idea for the Project to mix it up a bit anyhow—a 24 Column inch ad, a six-column inch ad, and a 24-page magazine. Give em a right, a left, a left right left!

U CALIFORNIA (Los Angeles) We have a couple secret agents at UCLA who have passed out thousands of copies of my leaflet, *The Holocaust Controversy: The Case for Open Debate*. They passed out *Revisionist Letters*, even copies of a little book I published a couple years ago and which I am not promoting because I am going to cannibalize it for a forthcoming title. Now they are set to distribute thousands of copies of *The Revisionist* on campus over a period of a couple weeks.

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust

Read the evidence. Judge for yourself.

Bradley R. Smith, Director
Voice Mail: 619 687 1950
POB 439016, San Diego CA, 92143

www.codoh.com

The ad running in the *Daily Collegian* at U Massachusetts

HOFSTRA University Five thousand copies of *The Revisionist* were to be inserted into a total print run of 6,600 copies of the Hofstra *Chronicle* the evening of Thursday 28 October. It was the first campus paper where TR would be distributed as an insert.

That afternoon I rang up the *Chronicle* to see if everything was on schedule and could only reach an answering machine. The message informed me that the paper had received so many telephone calls the system was "heavily overloaded," and that it might take several days for someone to get back to me.

Sunday afternoon I heard from a Hofstra student that on the evening of 28 November a student member of Hillel had been caught removing TR from the *Chronicle*. It was estimated he had removed about 1,000 copies before he was found out. He was taken into custody by campus security, but released. on Monday, 1 November.

I contacted Acting chairperson of the Hofstra journalism department Robert E. Green, two-time winner of the Pulitzer Prize. Greene informed me that he had received a copy of *The Revisionist* in his *Chronicle*, as had many of his friends, "to their dismay."

He noted that the *Chronicle* is independent of Hofstra University, but: "Had our department had some control over what The Chronicle prints and inserts, your message would most probably never have been distributed for reasons of both taste and historical accuracy."

At this point there began a lot of back and forth with faculty and student journalists—too much to report here. I will let the *Chronicle* itself give you a flavor for how *The Revisionist* can affect life on the campus.

(See next page for Hofstra *Chronicle* story.)

November 5, 1999

THE HOFSTRA CHRONICLE

(No by-line)

Last week's edition of The Chronicle has made some members of the University community angry, due to an inserted advertisement that questioned whether or not the Holocaust actually happened as history books claim.

The ad, placed by Holocaust revisionist Bradley Smith, was in the form of a magazine and was inserted into the middle of the paper. Smith's advertisement, called "The Revisionist: A Journal of Independent Thought", questioned widely held beliefs regarding the Holocaust, including how many Jews died in concentration camps and the existence of gas chambers.

A University student was issued an appearance summons for removing the inserts from issues of The Chronicle shortly after they were distributed last Thursday, according to Public Safety Director Ed Bracht.

University President James Shuart said he felt the paper was insensitive in running Smith's advertising supplement. "It's a matter of judgement and of maturity and seasoning," Shuart said. "I think it's wrong. A mature citizen has a responsibility to show restraint and decorum." Shuart also said that though he is not Jewish, he has great sympathy for those who perished in the Holocaust. "I have an obligation to say when something is in poor taste," Shuart said.

"I think [the paper's] sense of good taste is off the page." Rabbi Meir Mitelman, faculty advisor to Hillel and the University's Jewish chaplain, said he was extremely upset that the ad ran in the paper. "[The Chronicle] has no obligation to print all the ads it receives," Mitelman said. "I fervently hope that the students who are making editorial decisions at The Chronicle do some serious thinking about journalistic responsibility."

University Relations Vice President Michael DeLuise echoed the comments made by Mitelman. He added that it was not made clear enough that the insert was an ad that was not necessarily the opinion of the paper. "[The paper] didn't explain it was an ad," DeLuise said. "[The ad] was helping to ignite hate. I was very disappointed in [the paper's] action." Journalism and Mass Media Studies Associate Professor Steven R. Knowlton said that if he were an editor at the paper, he would have run the ad as well. Knowlton, the author of several books on journalism ethics, said he feels that a college campus is the right place to have a discussion about the views of people like Smith.

"I have no quarrel with The Chronicle deciding to accept this ad," Knowlton said. "I believe truth is better served engaging the Bradley Smith argument on a college campus where there is a history department full of professionals who can dispute his argument." Knowlton also said that he realized how offensive the ad might have been to the Jewish population on campus. "People like [Smith] are not going to go away," he said. "I don't quarrel with [Mitelman or Shuart], they have a good argument. However, eventually the weight of the argument goes the other way."

Acting Journalism and Mass Media Studies Department Chairperson Bob Greene disagreed with Knowlton. "I think [the paper] showed incredibly bad taste," Greene said. "This man paid...to carry an anti-Semitic message in the newspaper, and [The Chronicle] did it."

Associate Journalism professor Ellen Frisina, the faculty advisor to The Chronicle, said she supported the right of the paper to take advertisements from whomever it wants. "I understand it was a nearly unanimous decision of the Editorial Board to carry the insert, which shows forethought on their part," Frisina said. "Though I am personally repulsed by the context of the insert, I can support their decision to accept the advertisement."

Chronicle Editor-in-Chief Shawna VanNess said that the paper stands behind its decision. "Running Smith's ad is by no means endorsing his opinions," VanNess said. "We chose to accept Smith's ad not because we're in debt or in need of the money, but because we would be hypocritical in denying him a place to voice his opinion, when we ourselves fight so hard to ensure that our rights as a student newspaper are never infringed upon by the University or its administration."

Senior broadcast journalism major Dory Brown, a Hillel member, said he has no problem with the insert being put in the paper. "I think his views are wrong, but he is entitled to express his views," Brown said.

Freshman international business major Flora Sousa, said she thought the ad would get people talking. "It will make students think and it is better to get conversation going then to be silent," Sousa said.

Senior marketing major Ariel Wolkowscki thought it was insensitive for The Chronicle to run the Smith ad. "I thought it was rude for the paper to run it," Wolkowscki said. "It was hateful, and the

Board that the advertisement would serve as a catalyst to start intellectual discussion and debate about free speech and Holocaust Revisionism on campus.

"University officials can continue to condemn us, and they are entitled to their opinion," VanNess said. "Regardless of who thinks we are morally wrong, we as a paper know that our decision was right and necessary to protect the First Amendment and free speech."

Interesting story, I'd say. It did not end here. There is still the issue of the vandalism of **TR**, the back and forth I've had with faculty, and stories that are yet to come from it. We'll see how much of it I am able to get my hands on, and what I can make of it. Meanwhile, by the time you have this report to hand, **TR** will have been distributed in the Boise State University *Arbiter*. And there is other news about both the Holocaust Studies ad and *The Revisionist* that I will report on early in December.

The Holocaust Controversy: The Case for Open Debate, by Bradley R. Smith. The most widely read revisionist article ever published. Put them in those postage-free junk mail envelopes you otherwise throw away. Eight panels. 50 copies $5. 100 or more copies 8 cents ea. (postpaid).

LETTERS

Three Bravos for *The Revisionist*

I got my copy of the first "Revisionist" yesterday and have read it from cover to cover. My conclusion: BRAVO, BRAVO, BRAVO! I hope you are able to sustain the high level of the first issue. I particularly commend you for continuing all articles on the very next page and leaving off footnotes. But it is the high level of the articles that really "sells" it!

Anyway, my small contribution is in the mail. Could you send me a copy of the Carlo Mattogno booklet on Majdanek mentioned on page 24? Also, if you can, could you send me 10 copies of the magazine? If you can spare them I'll make sure they get to some people who will benefit from finding out that revisionists don't have pointy heads.

Albert Doyle, Fl

On Judging Others

Let's fight the evil rather than the people who are evil. God will take care of the punishment.

EKS Judge, VA

Thanks for this thoughtful note, and for all the other interesting and humanitarian letters you have sent me in the past. I think what you ask is right, but not easy, particularly in the debates that "rage" in the press. But I need to be reminded that I do not have anything against any person as an individual, but am focused on the acts of individuals that hurt and diminish others. The young Hillel man mentioned in the story on Hofstra U in this issue is a case in point. I hope to have nothing against him as an individual, but keep in my mind, and in my heart, that it is only his act that I will address.

Opening the Way

Hello. I'm a Turk and I'm saluting your honorable fight against the international Zionist dictatorship. I'm behind you with all my strength. As being a warrior for truth, you open the way to free-minded men, despite all physical and spiritual humiliations. Your sacrifices will not be lost. Thank you, and stand firm.

Sevgili Dostlar (via the Internet)

Your response to my appeal for help with getting *The Revisionist* off the ground was very generous. **TR** 2 is within days of being ready for the printer. Contributors and off-campus media will receive it the first week in December.

We couldn't have done this without your help. I appreciate it very much.

Bradley

Smith's Report

is produced by
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)

For your contribution of $29 you will receive five issues of *Smith's Report* plus five issues of *The Revisionist*
[$35 Canada and Mexico
$39 overseas]

All checks and correspondence to

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Diego, California 92143

T & F: 858 309 4385
Voice Mail: 619 687 1950
T & F: (Baja, Mexico)
011.52.661.23986

E-mail: CODOHMail@aol.com

On the Internet: www.codoh.com